

REMARKS

Applicant submits this Amendment with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. This Amendment is submitted on June 24, 2005, with a one-month extension of time. Applicant additionally requests the Examiner to enter the Amendment that was submitted on April 21, 2005.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended to the undersigned in a telephone interview conducted on June 17, 2005.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 10, 14-17, 21-23, 25, 26, 30-34, and 37 are amended to more clearly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as his invention. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Claim 24 is cancelled.

Claims 1-19, 21-23, and 25-37 are pending after entry of the present Amendment.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-16, 22-23, 25, 30, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smits, U. S. Patent No. 6,125,115. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Smits discloses a computer network teleconferencing system in which audio data are transformed and reproduced such that a listener in the teleconference perceives audio output associated with other participants in the teleconference as being located in different spaced-apart locations within a 3-D spatialization region. The methods and systems as disclosed in Smits transform and reproduce audio data. These methods and systems do not process text data. In contrast, embodiments of the present invention, as clarified by the amended claims, convert an audio component of the content data to text data, the text data is then processed to converted text data, and the converted text data is synthesized into audio data for output as

specified by content data output characteristics. Accordingly, claimed embodiments of the present invention process both audio and text data. However, the methods and systems of Smits only transform audio data, Smits does not teach the methods and systems for processing both audio and text data. More specifically, Smits does not teach the methods and systems for converting audio data to text data, processing the text data, and then synthesizing the text data back to audio data. Since Smits only teaches transforming audio data, Smits fails to disclose each and every limitation of the amended claims. Thus, Smits fails to anticipate the amended independent claims 1, 10, 14, 22, 30, 32 and 37. The independent claims are, therefore, patentable.

Accordingly, dependent claims 2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-13, 15-16, 21-23, 25, and 33-34 drawing their respective dependencies from independent claims 1, 10, 14, 22, or 32, along with respective intervening claims, are also not anticipated by Smits for substantially the same reasons discussed, and for the additional limitations that each dependent claim respective recites.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 3, 24, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Smits in view of the Examiner's Official Notice.

Based on the amendments for clarifying the claimed embodiments of the present invention, the Examiner's Official Notice does not cure the deficiencies of Smits. That is, even if the Examiner's Official Notice is properly taken, the combination of Smits and the Examiner's Official Notice still fails to disclose the methods and systems for converting audio data to text data, processing the text data to converted text data, and synthesizing the converted text data to audio data for output in accordance with content data output

characteristics. Accordingly, for substantially the same reasons as discussed above, the combination has not rendered claims 3 and 24 obvious.

Similarly, for substantially for same reasons as discussed above, claim 36 is not rendered obvious even if the Examiner's second Official Notice is combined with Smits.

Claims 6-7, 17-19, 21, 26-29, 35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Smits in view of Matsuda (European Patent EP0843168A2).

Matsuda has already been discussed in the Amendments as filed on April 8, 2005, and September 30, 2004, respectively, and the remarks are incorporated herein. Matsuda does not disclose the limitations of converting audio data to text data, processing the text data to converted text data, and synthesizing the converted text data to audio data for output in accordance with content data output characteristics. Accordingly, Matsuda fails to remedy the deficiencies of Smits. Thus, the combination of Smits and Matsuda fails to render the claimed embodiments obvious.


Claims 10 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Smits in view of Matsuda and further in view of Suzuki et al. (European Patent EP0696018A2).

Suzuki has already been discussed in the Amendments as filed on April 8, 2005, and September 30, 2004, respectively, and the remarks are incorporated herein. Suzuki does not disclose the limitations of converting audio data to text data, processing the text data to converted text data, and synthesizing the converted text data to audio data for output in accordance with content data output characteristics. For substantially the same reasons as discussed above, the combination of Smits, Matsuda, and Suzuki does not render claims 10 and 31 obvious.

In view of the foregoing, after entry of the present Amendment, the application is now in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6911. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805. (Order No. SONYP009). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



William K. Yee, Esq.
Reg. No. 54,943

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer No. 25920